

Ricigliano
10/764,701

REMARKS

The undersigned wishes to acknowledge the courteous treatment received by Mr. Belkin during an interview held with the Examiner on Nov. 4, 2004. The following discussion represents the substance of the discussion during the interview.

Claims 7-9 were rejected as being anticipated by Mazer.

Claims 1-5 were rejected as being unpatentable over Ricigliano in view of Mazer.

Claim 6 was rejected as being unpatentable over Ricigliano.

Mazer discloses an indoor golf course in which a concentric arrangement of target areas replaces the hole. The patent also teaches the use of multiple tees or playing positions, col. 2, lines 45-55.

Ricigliano has a simulated golf course and was cited for the intermediate target in each fairway.

In view of the excellent art cited by the Examiner, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the fairways have dogleg configurations, that the target areas are at the elbows of the fairways, and each tee area is made up of concentric rings in which tees are located, and that these concentric rings correspond with the rings of the target areas. See pages 3 and 4 of the specification as well as Fig. 3 of the drawings. Also recited is that each hole is configured to represent a different famous golf course or different world location. Support for this is in page 6 of the specification. This combination of features does not appear to be found or suggested in the art of record.

Claims 2-9 have been canceled and replaced with new claims 10-16.

Ricigliano
10/764,701

Claims 10-14 depend from claim 1 and add the features found in original (but now canceled) claims 2-7.

New claims 15-16 are drawn to a method of making an indoor golf course and includes the structural features found in claim 1 as amended. It is believed that there is no teaching or suggestion in the art of record for this method of making an indoor golf course. For example, depending claim 16 adds the step of simulating outdoor environmental conditions including saturating the course with water.

The matching of a tee in a specific ring in the tee area with a target ring for that tee in an elbow of the dogleg appears to be particularly novel. The Examiner's comment that it is well known for a player to move his tee to a more accommodating location in the tea area is noted, but does not suggest what is being claimed in this application.


In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the claims now in the case clearly distinguish over the art of record and should be allowed.

Ricigliano
10/764,701

A conscientious effort has been made to place this application in condition for immediate allowance. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned if further changes are required to obtain allowance of the application.

A favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


ALFRED M. WALKER
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 29, 983
225 Old Country Road
Melville, NY 11747-2712
631-361-8737

Dated: Dec 28, 2004

Certificate of Fax Transmission

I certify that the aforesaid Amendment has been sent by fax to 703-872-9306 on the date indicated below.

December 28, 2004


Alfred M. Walker

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.